

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 516

SP 015 591

AUTHOR Rothe, J. Peter
TITLE The Clinical Supervisor as Stranger: A Critical Look at Clinical Supervision. Occasional Paper No. 14.
INSTITUTION Alberta Univ., Edmonton. Faculty of Education.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 26p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Consultants; *Interpersonal Relationship; Role Perception; Self Concept; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision; Technical Assistance

ABSTRACT

The appropriateness of the supervisory model used in consulting is considered. Consulting as an activity is a social relationship between the "consultant" (faculty staff) and the "consultee" (teacher). Often the consultant employs the same verbal strategies used by a teacher's supervisors. The difficulties this creates in the personal interaction between the consultant and the teacher are discussed. Evaluation of a teacher's performance is implied by the presence of a consultant in the classroom, thus establishing a superior-inferior relationship. This produces a natural defensiveness and apprehension on the part of the teacher. Suggestions are made for changing attitudes in order to overcome these difficulties. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

jac
'79
2/12
SP

The Clinical Supervisor as Stranger: A Critical Look at Clinical Supervision

J. PETER ROTHE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ted T. Aoki

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Occasional Paper No. 14



Department of Secondary Education
Faculty of Education The University of Alberta

CURRICULUM, MEDIA & INSTRUCTION

To Our Reader:

This paper is part of the Department of Secondary Education's CMI Publication Series. It is an occasional paper, and as such we invite you to focus on a dimension of the field of CURRICULUM, MEDIA AND INSTRUCTION. It is also an informal paper and as such it is meant to allow the author to bring to the reader thoughts at some moment of development, from an early exploratory moment to a later more refined moment.

The series hopefully will consist of papers "occasionally" printed as relevant papers come our way. We see them as conversation pieces - "thought-works" that might engage readers and, possibly on occasions author and reader, to come together in a face-to-face "talk-talk".

Thus, we recognize the papers as being essentially incomplete, rooted in the idea that collaborations cannot be exhausted by an actual paper nor any actual reader. We ask you, our reader to collaborate by using the papers to grasp the reason for the essential incompleteness, that is, we ask you to grasp the conception of analysis which makes the papers possible. We ask you this because we feel that these papers themselves, although they have to be used to make the point, are never the point.

The point is, as far as we are concerned, in collaborative dialogue.

Communications Committee
Department of Secondary Education

Sr. Therese Craig
Dr. Madeleine Monod
Dr. Douglas Engel
Dr. T. Aoki
Kim Krawchenko, Assistant

CMI

Occasional Paper Series
No. 14

Published by

The Department of
Secondary Education
Faculty of Education
The University of Alberta

Copyright © 1979
held by the author

Editors' Note

A significant responsibility of Curriculum and Instruction staff is service as Faculty Consultants in student teaching situations. "Consulting" is seen as an important connection between courses in C. and I. and foundations on the one hand, and Practicum courses on the other. It is seen as an important activity that makes possible for students the integration between the two.

Consulting as an activity is a social relational matter between the "consultant" (Faculty Staff) and the "consultee" (student-teacher). There are multiple ways of viewing consulting, and at any one moment how consulting is viewed depends on the social theory underpinning it. Often consulting is couched in the same language used in talking about supervisors. More often than not such language reflects structural - functionalism, which is being seriously questioned in some quarters by sociologists and anthropologists.

In his paper, Peter Rothe, a student of curriculum and administration, raises fundamental issues regarding the appropriateness of the supervisory model used in consulting. In this paper he explores an alternative view grounded in existential phenomenology.

Whether the reader agrees with him or not, Rothe compels us to step back and examine how we have constituted ourselves our own sense of "consulting".

- P.R. & Communications Committee
Department of Secondary Education

The Clinical Supervisor as Stranger:
A Critical Look at Clinical Supervision

by J. Peter Rothe^{*}

Note: This paper was not developed in an ideological vacuum. It was written in light of full understanding that educators demand some form of supervision activities. For example, at the university level faculty consultants supervise student teachers, while at the school level principals supervise teachers, and so forth. Because of the self-perpetuation of authority by people in authority, the social structure of education is not likely to change dramatically. The intent underlying supervision, however, may change. It is with this underlying hope that this paper is written.

Supervision has traditionally been defined as activities leading to improvement of instruction, morale, human relations, in-service education, and curriculum development (Wiles, 1967). According to Neagley and Evans (1970), supervision is destined to:

play an essential role in deciding the nature and content of the curriculum, in selecting the school organizational patterns and learning materials to facilitate teaching and in evaluating the entire educational process (1970, p. 4).

Facilitating teacher improvement has become the hallmark of "clinical supervision", a supervisory process typically comprised of a preobservation conference, observation period, observation analysis, supervision conference, and supervision conference analysis. Central to this process is the clinical

^{*} Dr. J. Peter Rothe, a student of educational administration and curriculum, is currently research associate with The Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, Vancouver. He completed his M.Ed. degree at the University of Alberta (Secondary Education) and received his doctorate in Educational Administration/Curriculum Studies at the University of British Columbia. His research strength lies in phenomenological analysis, particularly ethno-methodology and conversational analysis.

supervisor-teacher interaction which Cogan (1973) suggests should occur within a 'colleagial' relationship, whereby participants 'share' a common goal. Within this framework, Blumberg (1974) proposes that the teacher-clinical supervisor interaction consist of the following components:

- (1) The supervisor has ideas, attitudes and feelings he wishes to communicate.
- (2) The supervisor communicates either verbally or non-verbally to the teacher.
- (3) The supervisor behaves through the teacher's perceptual screen.
- (4) The teacher digests and interprets his experiences of the supervisor's behavior.
- (5) The teacher communicates his ideas, attitudes, etc.
- (6) The teacher behaves through the supervisor's perceptual screen.

Educators who support clinical supervision have relied on an outline such as Blumberg's as the basic framework for conceptualizing the process. However, "clinical supervision" lacks critical analysis of the interaction process within its social context. To provide a beginning of such an analysis, I have focussed on clinical supervision from a phenomenological perspective. As a framework for analyzing the social structure which underlies clinical supervisor-teacher relationships, I introduce a phenomenological ideal type, the stranger.

Ideal-Types for Analysis

According to Weber, people have conceptual patterns or constructs of the world which they use to make sense: He wrote:

The conceptual pattern brings together certain relationships and events of historical life into a complex, which is conceived as an internally consistent system. Substantively, this construct in itself is like a utopia which has been arrived at by the analytical accentuation of certain elements of reality. Its relationship to empirical data consists solely in the fact

that where relationships of the type referred to by the abstract construct are discovered or suspected to exist in reality to some extent, we can make the characteristic features of this relationship pragmatically clear and understandable by reference to an ideal-type. This procedure can be indispensable for heuristic as well as expository purposes. The ideal typical concept will help to develop our skill in imputation in research; It is no hypothesis but it offers guidance to the construction of hypotheses. It is not a description of reality but it aims to give unambiguous means of expression to such a description. It is thus the "idea" of a historically given society, which is developed for us by quite the same logical principles as are used in constructing the idea of the medieval "city economy" as a "genetic" concept. When we do this, we construct the concept "city economy" not as an average of the economic structures actually existing in all the cities observed but as an ideal-type. An ideal-type is formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct... . When carefully applied, these concepts are particularly useful in research and exposition.

(Weber, 1949, pp. 84-90)

Discussion of social forms and problems implies selectively defined ideal-types. Although ideal-types are often used, educators seldom reflect on the assumptions underlying them. For example, administrators often distinguish between supervision and consultation, principal and manager, school and factory, and student and raw material without explicating all exhaustive details to which those ideal-types refer. Administrators typically assign these ideal-types cash value meanings, or meanings which to them are commonplace. In their mind is an implicit model, a selective picture whose features they think are distinctive and important.

Ideal-types are based upon evaluative conceptions. They consist of imputed meanings which can be subjectively understood and phenomenologically observed through awareness of motives. For example, school principals impute constant "in-order-to motives" to an ideal-type. These motives correspond to ends which principals want realized by their acts. Principals may administer

"in-order-to" gain power over teachers. In this case the principal as an ideal-type may mean authority. In addition to "in-order-to motives" are "because-of motives" which serve as a basis for "in-order-to motives". To illustrate, "because-of" their position principals participate on provincial committees "in-order-to" have a better chance of becoming an assistant superintendent. The ideal-type principal may now assume the cash value meaning of authority and potential for promotion.

Explicit use of ideal types has found its way into supervision literature. Cogan (1973) constructed ideal types such as the 'Spinster Supervisor', 'Supervisor as Evaluator', and 'Supervision as Colleagueship'. In this paper the phenomenological ideal type used is 'Clinical Supervisor as Stranger'. First, the social structure which provides the context for clinical supervision is described. Second, some major assumptions which support the ideal-type, "Clinical Supervisor as Stranger," are clarified. Third, the influences these assumptions have on the interpretations of clinical supervisor-teacher interaction are highlighted by providing partial analysis of a case study described by Goldhammer (1969) in his book.

School as a Horizon of Social Meaning

From a micro-sociological perspective, (study of dialectical processes of small social units) the social horizon of school is the context in which teachers experience routine institutionalized procedures. Teachers regard schools as home territories where they have a certain degree of control, some sense of intimacy and freedom of behavior, and where they find their bearings without difficulty. Here, teachers share a common stock of knowledge which helps structure their in-school activities. They are generally aware of their habitual activities. They form an in-group in which they enjoy proactive status. As group members they share relevances, or important features

ascribed by individuals to selected aspects of daily life, recipe knowledge, or knowledge about what works for teachers, typifications, or typical motivations, goals and action patterns, and interpretive schemes, or understanding of education vernacular influenced by specific time and place.

Teachers as a group can be analyzed according to intrinsic or imposed relevances. Intrinsic relevances reflect teachers' chosen interests. They are established by teachers' spontaneous decisions to solve problems or attain projected states of affairs (Schutz, 1971). For example, a social studies teacher has completed her lesson fifteen minutes before the official bell. She may, therefore, decide to present students with a local issue for discussion in order to maintain the school's timetabling routine and to provide students with an opportunity where they may engage in meaningful dialogue. The teacher decides to do this rather quickly because of her teaching experience and professional training.

Teachers are also recipients of imposed events and circumstances. These impositions are not connected to the teachers' intrinsic relevances. They do not originate in acts of teachers' discretion. Hence, group members usually accept them in a passive manner. For example, supervisory duties can be interpreted as imposed. Although supervisory activities pertain to instruction, the teacher has little power to modify them unless she wishes to chance dismissal.

Imposed relevance is clearly evident in clinical supervision. Blumberg (1974) indicated that the supervisor's entry into the classroom is a major obstacle. This observation is not surprising. Traditionally, teachers maintain a 'closed door policy' which serves as an insulation barrier between occupants of the class and outsiders. The policy illustrates a teacher's intrinsic relevance whereby she maintains her right to use her recipe

knowledge about education, teaching or appropriate classroom behavior. The clinical supervisor, however, is an institutionally defined actor who can impose his wishes on teachers. For example, the clinical supervisor has the authority to supervise a teacher regardless of objections. His purposes usually coincide with the goals of administration. As a result the clinical supervisor does not share the teachers' goals or "natural" conception of the world. Although he may have originally been a teacher, his new role of clinical supervisor brings with it new allegiances, purposes and duties, whereby opportunities for conflicting views between teacher and clinical supervisor arise.

The teacher's "natural" conception of the world is composed of various typifications (action patterns) sufficiently integrated and transparent for solving most classroom problems. Typifications emerge through everyday school experiences; they are taken-for-granted typified notions of students, community, parents, principals, counsellors, and so forth. All teachers as members of an in-group share a similar relevance, because each member of a group is expected by other members to act in a typical way.

Typical definitions and actions form trustworthy recipes for teachers when they instruct students. For example, testing (for evaluation and promotion), student hand-raising (for orderly classroom discussions), worksheets (for student learning activities), and desk placement (for classroom organization) are standard recipes teachers use to obtain maximum results with minimum effort. These recipes help validate teachers' reality. Teachers are recognized by members of society because they use recipes which are commonly assumed to define teaching. Recipes comprise teachers' thinking-as-usual which is maintained providing the following basic assumptions, cited by Schutz (1971), hold true:

1. That the same problems requiring the same solutions recur so that former experiences suffice for mastering future situations.
2. That teachers rely on the knowledge handed down to them by tradition, habits, government, university research, etc.
3. That in the ordinary course of affairs it is sufficient to know 'something' about the general type or style of events encountered in order to manage or control them.
4. That neither the system recipes, as schemes of interpretation and expression, nor the preceding underlying assumptions are a (teacher's) private affair, but are likewise accepted and implied by (fellow-teachers).

These assumptions are not shared by out-group individuals such as supervisors. In light of the various assumptions that underly a group, clinical supervisors may be regarded as newcomers or strangers who encounter the cultural pattern of a group such as teachers:

not as a shelter but a field of adventure, not a matter of course, but a questionable topic of investigation, not an instrument for disentangling problematic situations but a problematic situation itself and one hard to master (Schutz, 1971, p. 104).

The Clinical Supervisor as Stranger

To arrive at the meaning an action has for an actor one must uncover the actor's purpose for the action. Clinical supervisors such as Goldhammer, Mosher and Purpel, Cogan, and Blumberg suggest that the major purpose for clinical supervision is changing teacher behavior for the concomitant purpose of changing student behavior. In revised terms, the clinical supervisor's major goal is to improve student learning by instruction (Cogan, 1973).

Instructional improvement is based on a clinical supervisor-teacher relationship which is founded within an educational system that is comprised of formally organized and functionally specific system of roles.

Within this system clinical supervisors and teachers are "agents" who perform socially defined tasks. In fact, typifications such as clinical supervisors or teachers imply designated and understood social locations. For example, the label "clinical supervisor" suggests a medical metaphor revolving around a clinician's "expert knowledge". In the medical context the clinical process involves a patient undergoing examination, diagnosis and prescription. The purpose for the patient-clinician (doctor) relationship is specifically defined and calculated. A patient is ill and requires a cure. The doctor diagnoses the illness and prescribes a treatment. If the patient follows the doctor's prescription his condition is expected to improve.

In terms of clinical supervision clinical supervisors and teachers are functionaries much like doctors and patients. The clinical supervisor functions as an intermediate, inventive, trained professional committed to helping teachers (Cogan, 1973). He perceives the teacher as an individual who requires help in planning, resource selection and instruction. The clinical supervisor interacts with teachers to help define teacher improvement. Like a doctor working within the medical model, the clinical supervisor has the manifest or latent authority to decide on what is correct or incorrect strategy for action. He assumes explicitly or implicitly, the role of authority, who, if necessary, defines the weaknesses, and suggests the strategies for improvement. In the final analysis, improvement pertains to the clinical supervisor's point-of-view. A clinical supervisor has the authority to exercise certain procedures which enhance his chance of accomplishing his goal. According to Peters, a person such as a clinical supervisor can have his way by means of:

an appeal to an impersonal normative order or value system which regulates behaviour basically because of acceptance of it on the part of those who comply. It operates because of understanding of and concern for what is intimated within a rule-governed form of life, which those in authority help to create and sustain. Authority, of course, may be and usually is supported by various forms of power. Behind the symbolic gestures of the policeman lies the coercive power which he can summon, or his hypnotic stare, (1970, p. 239).

Supporting the clinical supervisor's symbolic gestures of collegiality is the power of the education system. System maintainers such as administrators support the clinical supervisor's interpretation of "what is required to improve instruction".

Cogan (1973) implies that part of instructional improvement is an evaluation of teacher performance. He suggests that the purpose of evaluation should not be explicated to the teacher, but rather that the clinical supervisor should:

- (a) divorce himself from the role of evaluator until he and the teacher agree that such a role would be productive for both;
- (b) not picture himself to the teacher as being without, above, or beyond evaluation;
- (c) establish a relationship to deal with the teacher's residual anxieties about evaluation, a relationship characterized by mutual trust, confidentiality and confidence (Cogan, 1973, p. 65).

The clinical supervisor introduces "companionable interaction" in order to enhance his purpose of teacher evaluation. Seldom are the ethics which underly these tactics questioned. The clinical supervisor attempts to engage teachers in an I - We (consociate) relationship, an association in which group members are recognized by one another as unique individuals in unique biographical situations. The clinical supervisor-teacher relationship, however, is a contracted association in which the teacher and clinical supervisor experience each other through typical behavior and typical patterns of

motives and attitudes. The clinical supervisor improvises his role so that he can take advantage of the teacher's line of action. Correspondingly, the teacher produces interactional strategies according to the clinical supervisor's role improvisation. For example, depending on the situation the teacher may display forms of "superficial intercourse" such as apologetics, innocence, naivety, inferiority, humbleness, or feigned attentiveness (Znanicki, 1963). This form of interaction makes an I - We relationship suggested by clinical supervision writers extremely questionable.

The Right to Say We

Teachers are members of a group in which each member has a definite status in the group and is aware of the status. Therefore, only members can use a group's thinking-as-usual as a natural and trustworthy scheme of orientation. The clinical supervisor may find himself a border case where he is a stranger to the territory of the teachers' scheme of orientation. Teachers may not grant a clinical supervisor the privilege of considering himself a legitimate and acceptable member of the school's social environment. The clinical supervisor interprets the school environment according to his own thinking-as-usual and purposes. He lacks teacher in-group status because of his thinking-as-usual (outside ideas of the group), potential for social and/or physical transience, (coming and going from the classroom) and non-alignment with the group's pattern of behavior and way of life (as a member of an administrative group). Yet, proponents of clinical supervision define the supervisory process as a partnership in which the teacher and supervisor work in harmony for a common goal. In short, the teacher and clinical supervisor supposedly form an I - We relationship engaging in "we talk". However, because of social structural differences previously outlined "we talk" is a strategy employed by a clinical supervisor to align a teacher

as an associate whereby the teacher is influenced to agree. The "we" may not be an authentic "we". In clinical-supervisor - teacher interactions authentic use of "we" is difficult because:

"We" is basically equalitarian. Normally, it can be applied only to personal beings of the same social standing or class. Especially in a nondemocratic or hierarchical organization such as an army a superior will hardly be included in we-talk in his presence by his inferiors, even if the superior may do this condescendingly with his subordinates. (Spiegelberg, 1972, p. 133).

It would be beneficial to outline the German use of "du" and "sie" to further clarify clinical supervisors' patronizing use of "we". Based on tradition Germans use "sie" when they address strangers, or persons who are recognized as having superior social standing. Such persons may be doctors, administrators, or professors. If an individual takes for granted that a person has a similar social standing and/or if that person is close to one's personal self, he is addressed by "du". The "du" address is similar to "we" as intended in the I - We relationship supposedly possible between a teacher and clinical supervisor. But, because of the implied differences in social standing, in Germany the clinical supervisor would be addressed by the teacher as "sie" and not "du". The implicit superordinate-subordinate relationship between clinical supervisor and teacher makes it doubtful that an equalitarian sense of We is possible.

Clinical Supervisor - Teacher Face Work

Different purposes, assumptions, stocks of knowledge, typifications and relevances between the clinical supervisor and teacher influence their face-to-face interaction. As Laing's aphorism aptly illustrates:

They are playing a game. They are playing at not playing a game game. If I show them I see they are, I shall break the rules and they will punish me. I must play their game, of not seeing I see the game (1970, p. 1).

In the process of clinical supervision, the clinical supervisor and teacher 'officially' engage in face-work, defined by Goffman (1967) as participants sustaining an image. In face-to-face interaction participants act out a line; that is, a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which they express their view of the situation and through which they evaluate each other evaluating themselves. Each person develops an impression of the other and thereby develops an impression of himself. Each individual takes a stand in terms of the roles within which one responds to the other, and the perceived intents underlying the interaction. To help clarify components of clinical supervisor-teacher face-work, extracts of a clinical supervisor-teacher conference taken from Goldhammer (1969) serve as illustrations.

Typically, the clinical supervisor maintains the face or image of a supervisor. During interactions he should present an image that is externally consistent, or that is supported by judgments and evidence conveyed through teachers' experiences with supervisors and administrators. But the clinical supervisor does not uphold a consistent line. The clinical supervisor's purpose is to improve and evaluate instruction. His social status is that of a stranger or outsider whose superordinate position is supported by administrators. Yet he wishes to engage teachers in "we" talk. His line is 'out of face' with his purpose and group status. He desires face-to-face interaction with teachers without having ready a line which teachers have when they interact with one another. Hence, he covers or hides his intentions to evaluate teaching by evading or avoiding topics of discussion which may be inconsistent with the image of a supporting person. For example, in a conference with a teacher, the clinical supervisor may wish to avoid confrontation. So, he acts with diffidence and composure, suppressing critical comments until he recognizes the line a teacher will be ready to support. He

then takes advantage of the situation and manipulates the teacher's thinking. This device is evident in Goldhammer's case study where the clinical supervisor's aim is:

to begin the conference slowly, gently enough to provide time in which he might develop some sense of Teacher's immediate anxiety and learn, from her statements, which of his ideas could be assimilated most readily. He decided, additionally, that he would keep his thinking as open as possible, that is, that he would reveal his assumptions, his inferences, his uncertainties, and his reasons for saying whatever he said so that at least, in the absence of convincing documentary material, he might prevent a mystique from developing around his supervisory processes and might avoid excessively arbitrary behavior. Finally, he decided that if Teacher initiated inquiries about her lesson and seemed capable of performing intellectual labor in analysis, he would go in whatever directions she indicated. Should she fail to manifest such behavior, Foster decided that, employing her lesson as a point of departure, he would attempt to shape Teacher's expectations of supervision, inductively if he could, didactically if he must, so that the conference should not be wasted despite its present handicaps. (1969, p. 44).

The clinical supervisor presents an inconsistent face in order to avoid intensifying the teacher's general irritation. Laing's poetic comment illustrates a teacher's potential plight towards an on-coming face-to-face conference with a clinical supervisor:

There is something I don't know
 that I am supposed to know.
 I don't know what it is I don't know,
 and yet I am supposed to know,
 and I feel I look stupid
 if I seem both not to know it
 and not to know what it is I don't know.
 Therefore I pretend to know it.
 This is nerve-racking
 since I don't know what I must pretend to know.
 Therefore I pretend to know everything.

I feel that you know what I am supposed to know
 but you can't tell me what it is
 because you don't know that I don't know what it is.

You may know what I don't know, but not
 that I don't know it,
 and I can't tell you. So you will have
 to tell me everything (1970, p. 56).

Laing's dialectic is a valuable analytic vehicle when one reads the following segment of conversation found in Goldhammer's case study:

1. SUPERVISOR: Hi. C'mon in.
2. TEACHER: Uh, hi.
3. SUPERVISOR: Have a seat.
4. TEACHER: Thank you. [Pause.] Well, did that set teaching back a thousand years [forced laugh]?
5. SUPERVISOR: Oh, maybe not a thousand. [Laughter]. Are you serious?
6. TEACHER: Well, that's what I want to find out.
7. SUPERVISOR: How effective the lesson was?
8. TEACHER: Not just that. I mean, I know this sounds silly, but - what's confusing to me is how you know whether the kids are learning and even what they *should* be learning. Do you know what I mean?
9. SUPERVISOR: Uh, it's hard to know when, uh, if kids have learned what you were trying to teach them -
10. TEACHER: Yes.
11. SUPERVISOR: And sometimes it's confusing when you think about what you should really be teaching them?
12. TEACHER: Yeah, that's right.
13. SUPERVISOR: That doesn't sound silly to me. These are very difficult questions. [Pause].
14. TEACHER: It's like I'm never sure.
15. SUPERVISOR: About?
16. TEACHER: About where they are and what should happen next. (1969, p. 215).

The teacher's hesitating statement in utterance 4 reflects Laing's opening lines, "There is something I don't know/that I am supposed to know". It appears that the teacher is saying, "There is something I did not do that I was supposed to do. I don't know what it is and I feel insecure. Therefore I will work my way out by forcing the humorous question, "Did I set teaching back a thousand years?"

The clinical supervisor devises his role according to how he might best make use of the teacher's line of action. For example, if the teacher has negative feelings about the clinical supervisor, he may temporarily redefine his role so that he can change the teacher's views and thereby enhance accomplishment of his purpose. This form of interaction may be classified as domination (Simmel, 1971). An example of this format is found in

Goldhammer's case study, where, after a short conversation with a teacher the clinical-supervisor stated:

63. SUPERVISOR: Well, don't be so quick to throw your ideas away. Look, uh, I don't know that I really intended it this way, but what have I been teaching you during the last five minutes? (1972, p. 218).

It appears that the clinical supervisor expects the teacher to frame her ideas according to what "he has been teaching her" rather than what she as a professional may deem proper.

A typical linguistic device individuals use whenever their actions are subjected to evaluative inquiry is the account. There are generally two types of accounts: excuses and justifications (Austin, 1961). Excuses are socially approved vocabularies for mitigating or relieving responsibility when conduct is questioned (Lyman and Scott, 1970). Justifications are accounts in which one accepts responsibility for the act in question, but denies the pejorative quality associated with it. If the clinical supervisor had an authentic I - We relationship with a teacher there would be no need for justifications such as:

140. TEACHER: In a sense, yes. I had my idea of the lesson and I just didn't want to go off in all directions, uh, I guess mostly because you were watching and I felt kind of nervous. (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 23).

The clinical supervisor as a superordinate with decision-making power implicitly places the teacher in a subordinate position. The teacher's role is largely defined by school board policies which the clinical supervisor helps reinforce. The teacher is powerless since she cannot substantially influence district-wide classroom supervision policy. An illustration of the superordinate-subordinate relationship is evident in Goldhammer's case study where the clinical supervisor has made critical observations inconsistent with the teacher's prior teaching evaluation:

186. TEACHER: Uh, this lesson is one I taught in student teaching, uh, for my supervisor. And she she gave it an "A". What she said was, uh, you need good discipline to teach, and there were no discipline problems. I mean, the kids behaved pretty much the way they did today. And that she could see I was prepared, because the kids had their worksheets. And that since I used music, uh, a song, in an arithmetic lesson, that that showed "creativity": and that one sign of good teaching is that most of the kids participate, you know? And in this lesson, *every* child participated, and, so, you know, I got an "A": for the lesson.

187. SUPERVISOR: Oh. [Pause]. I guess this must come as a disap -

188. TEACHER: Oh, no! Don't misunderstand me. I feel very good about it. I mean, it was very upsetting to me because I just didn't feel comfortable with, uh, I mean I just couldn't believe that this was such a great lesson, and I was kind of worried that you would say the same thing; and then I'd be right back where I started. No, I think this is good. (1969).

In the conversation it appears that the teacher bargains her sense of realness with great effort to make the supervisor believe that the interaction is authentic. Yet it appears that the teacher recognizes the inauthenticity of the interaction in statement 188. She brings the conversation near, yet through nearness she keeps her inner sense of realness distant. For the purpose of appeasing the clinical supervisor, the teacher becomes what she is not. Although she finally appears to agree with the clinical supervisor, the agreement seems forced.

Typically, the clinical supervisor's definition of "good teaching" takes priority over the teacher's point of view. In other words, the clinical supervisor predefines the right or correct style of teaching. He attempts to induce a certain form of teaching although there are no set systems of teaching and no agreed aims of education (Peters, 1970). Any suggestion for improvement is always a matter of opinion. In clinical supervision what is suggested for improvement is what can be observed. For

example, the clinical supervisor observes a class according to the implicit need for improvement. Hence his post observation conference with the teacher may be bounded by the following mind-set:

There must be something the matter with him
because he would not be acting as he does
unless there was
therefore he is acting as he is
because there is something the matter with him.

He does not think there is anything the matter with him because
one of the things that is
the matter with him
is that he does not think there is anything
the matter with him
therefore

(1) have to help him realize
the fact that he does not think there is anything
the matter with him
is one of the things that is
the matter with him

there is something the matter with him
because he thinks

there must be something the matter with (me)
for trying to help him see
that there must be something the matter with him
to think that there is something the matter with (me)
for trying to help him see that

(1) am helping him

to see that

(1) am not persecuting him
by helping him
to see that

he is refusing to see
that there is something the matter with
him

for not seeing that there is something the matter with him
for not being grateful to (me)
for at least trying to help him

to see that there is something the matter with him

for not seeing that there must be something the
matter with him

for not seeing that there must be something the
matter with him

for not seeing that there is something the
matter with him

for not seeing that there is something the
matter with him

for not being grateful

that we never tried to make him
feel grateful.

(Laing, 1970, p.p. 6-7).

Laing's dialectic is significant when related to Goldhammer's case study, where the clinical supervisor develops a pre-conference strategy. He recognized:

on the one hand, that he could neither be certain about salient patterns in Mrs. Constance's teaching nor about the effects of her teaching upon the pupils on the basis of this single observation and, on the other hand, that Teacher had already shown signs of anxiety about supervision during their two short previous conversations together. He was aware, in other words, of the paucity of data and of the problems that would confront him if Teacher resisted analysis of her lesson. Foster also realized that as Mrs. Constance's first sequence of supervision, the forthcoming conference should be managed most carefully to avoid inappropriate incidental learnings about supervision. In order to follow through on his promise to provide feedback, Supervisor would have to engage in some form of analysis, yet to do so would involve a high degree of speculation (given the absence of demonstrative data). He did not, however, want Teacher to learn that supervisory analysis was essentially conjectural, abstract, and related to actual events only by filaments of Supervisor's imagination. In effect, Supervisor had to balance a weak analysis, a minimum of pertinent information, and what promised to be an anxious conference for Teacher in some manner that would, simultaneously, enable him to keep his promise, to reduce whatever excessive anxiety Teacher experienced, and to teach her the right things and avoid teaching her the wrong things about clinical supervision and the manner in which it would be likely to operate in their relationship. To make things even more difficult, Foster also had to manage his own feelings about the lesson which, in his estimation, was without virtue.

(Goldhammer, 1969, p. 214).

Laing's dialectic statement is not only relevant to the interaction component of clinical supervision but to the whole process of clinical supervision. The process by its very nature takes on a corrective posture. Correction implies something is not sufficient. The clinical supervisor observes, analyzes and finally holds teacher discussions based on Laing's definition of a mind set. The clinical supervisor-teacher interaction is intricately linked to the social structure which supports the process of observation and analysis. The ideal-type "clinical supervisor as stranger" has served to highlight this linkage.

Conclusion

Clinical supervision is based on an individual's explicit or implicit judgment on "what should be" without fully accounting for the features that define a class, a teacher, a supervisor or an interaction. Supervisors should become more attentive to the teacher's common sense interpretations of objectives, instruction, education, and so forth. Supervision studies might focus on (1) the manner in which the concept of school organization is invoked by members to solve educational problems; (2) the meanings that supervision acquire through being referred to the generalized formula of teaching; and (3) how behavior is presented as "being in accord with local rules".

Teacher behavior is not a simple outcome of a "formal educational structure". Enacted rules operate in social situations only by continual interpretation of their "meaning" in the context of common sense decision-making. Activities that appear to be in accord with a rule such as the "proper" form of teaching and classroom behavior are ongoing practical accomplishments of teachers. School personnel, however, know they have to demonstrate (if only retrospectively) that they are doing (have done) things according to the book. This reconstructed reasoning appeases the clinical supervisors but does not define the every day reality of teaching.

The supervisor-teacher relationship should, therefore, assume a revelatory posture whereby the supervisor attempts to account for his immediate environment and the meaning the teacher assigns to teaching.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin, J.L. Philosophical Papers. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Berger, P., and T. Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1966.
- Blumberg, A. Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War. Berkeley: McCutchan Inc., 1974.
- Cogan, M.L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1973.
- Coser, L. Masters of Sociological Thought. New York: Harcourt Brade Javanovich, 1971.
- Filmer, P., Phillipson, H., Silverman, D., and Walsh, D. New Directions in Sociological Theory. London: Collier - MacMillan, 1972.
- Fletcher, R. The Making of Sociology 2. Great Britain: Nelson University Press, 1971.
- Goffman, I. Interaction Ritual. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1967.
- _____. Asylums. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1967.
- _____. Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction. New York: Boobs - Merrill Co. Inc., 1961.
- Goldhammer, R. Clinical Supervision. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Housego, I. "School Boards and School Administrators: Patterns in Educational Decision-Making; And Evaluation. An address prepared for the B.C.S.T.A., Vancouver, March 4, 1972.
- _____. "Educational Supervision: A Functional Definition". An address prepared for the B.C. Supervisors of Instruction P.S.A. Annual Conference, Parksville, October, 1973.
- Jehenson, L. "On the Phenomenology of Formal Organizations". In G. Psathas (Ed.) Phenomenological Sociology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
- Laing, R.D. Knots. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1970.
- Lyman, S., and Scott, M. A Sociology of the Absurd. New York: Appleton - Century - Crofts, 1970.
- McCall, G.J., and J.L. Simmons. "The Dynamics of Interaction". In K. Thompson and J. Tunstall (Eds.) Sociological Perspectives. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1971.

- Natanson, H. "Anonymity and Recognition: Toward an Ontology of Social Roles". In W. von Baeyer and R.M. Griffith (Eds.) Conditio Humana. New York: Springer Verlag, 1966.
- Neagley, R.L. and Evans, D. A Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice - Hall, 1970.
- Peters, R.S. Ethics and Education. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- Rothe, P. "Georg Simmel as Stranger". An unpublished paper, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, 1976.
- Schutz, A. On Phenomenology and Social Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- _____. Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- _____. Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971.
- Simmel, G. The Sociology of Georg Simmel. New York: The Free Press, 1950.
- _____. Individuality and Social Forms. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Spiegelberg, H. On the right to say "we": a linguistic and phenomenological analysis (1). In G. Psathas (Ed.), Phenomenological Sociology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
- Strasser, S. Phenomenology and the Social Sciences. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Free Press, 1963.
- Toennies, F. Community and Society. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1957.
- Weber, M. The Methodology of the Social Sciences. New York: Free Press, 1949.
- Wiles, K. Supervision For Better Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

DEPT. OF SECONDARY EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS
CMI OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

- | | | |
|--------|--|--------|
| No. 1 | "Democracy and Evaluation"
by Barry MacDonald, University of East Anglia, U.K. | \$1.00 |
| No. 2 | "Toward Curriculum Inquiry In a New Key"
by Ted T. Aoki, University of Alberta, Edmonton | \$1.00 |
| No. 3 | "Talk about School Subjects: A Sociological View"
by Richard D. Heyman, The University of Calgary | \$1.00 |
| No. 4 | <p>A. "Art Education in One Dimension:
Reaching into the Future from the Perspective of
Ideology." (1977)</p> <p>B. "An Inquiry into the Process of Aesthetic Socialization
During School Tours at an Art Museum." (1978)
by Nancy R. Johnson, Department of Art
Education, State University of New York</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 5 | <p>"The Future—Its Challenge and Implications
for Public Decision Making."</p> <p>Desmond E. Berghofer, Assistant Deputy Minister,
Alberta Advanced Education and Manpower</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 6 | <p>"Teaching as Being: The Right to Personhood"
by Beverley A. Cunningham,
University of British Columbia</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 7 | <p>"Curriculum in Alberta: A Study of Perceptions"
by Kim Krawchenko, Pat Paradis,
and Bill Sommerfeld, University of Alberta</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 8 | <p>"The International Year of the Child—1979:
'More of Same' or Radical Critique?"
by David G. Smith, University of Alberta</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 9 | <p>"A Critical Analysis of Teacher Education from
the Perspective of Curriculum"
by Donald C. Wilson, University of British Columbia</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 10 | <p>"The Use of Qualitative Forms of Evaluation
for Improving Educational Practice"
by Elliot W. Eisner, Stanford University</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 11 | <p>"Evaluation: Sense-Making of School Programs"
by Walter Werner, University of British Columbia</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 12 | <p>"Towards A New Aesthetic"
by John Jagodzinski, The University of Alberta</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 13 | <p>"The Early Adolescent and the Junior High School
Curriculum by Jame B. Bell and
Peter Ackerman, University of Alberta</p> | \$1.00 |
| No. 14 | <p>"The Clinical Supervisor as Stranger:
A Critical Look at Clinical Supervision"
by J. Peter Rothe, Educational Research Institute
of British Columbia</p> | \$1.00 |

26

Please Note: Shipping costs are added to above prices.